DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 835 CG 026 287

AUTHOR Yager, Geoffrey G.; And Others
TITLE The Effect of Recognition of Counselor and Counselor Skill on Counselor Trainees' Ratings of a Videotaped Counselor Effectiveness.
PUB DATE 18 Apr 95
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Counselor Educators; Counselor Performance; Counselors; *Counselor Training; *Familiarity; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; *Instructional Films; Instructional Material Evaluation; *Microcounseling; Recognition (Psychology); Training Methods; *Videotape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS *Counselor Effectiveness; *Video Viewing

ABSTRACT

Most counselor training programs make extensive use of videotaped demonstrations to convey information about important aspects of counselor behaviors and skills. This study investigates three questions: (1) Is an "inappropriate" counselor perceived as less effective than an "appropriate" counselor? (2) Is a recognized counselor perceived as more effective than an unrecognized counselor? and (3) What is the interaction between these two variables? Findings indicate that the inappropriate counselor was rated virtually identically whether the role player was known or unknown. However, in the demonstration of an appropriately skilled counselor, the unrecognized counselor was rated consistently and significantly lower on each subscale. These findings suggest that videotapes using unknown counselors may be less effective than those using counselors known to the trainees. (JE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 384 835

The Effect of Recognition of Counselor and Counselor Skill on Counselor Trainees' Ratings of a Videotaped Counselor Effectiveness

Geoffrey G. Yager

Bernadette D. Johns

Michael A. Ingram

Retta Brown

University of Cincinnati

Paper Presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting

San Francisco, CA

April 18, 1995 -- Session 1.32

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. YAGER

2 TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

CG026287

Abstract

This study involved a 2 X 2 design with factors including (a) Recognition of Counselor (i.e., "known" or "unknown") and (b) Counselor Skill (i.e., "appropriate" or "inappropriate"). "Inappropriate" counselors focused away from the client's emotions and experience. Four seven-minute counseling segments were videotaped, and counseling students were randomly assigned to watch one tape. Participants completed the Counselor Rating Form to assess the perceived effectiveness of the observed videotaped counselor. A MANOVA yielded a significant interaction between Recognition of Counselor and Counselor Skill. The inappropriately skilled counselor was rated virtually identically whether the role player was known or unknown. However, with a skilled counselor, the unrecognized counselor was rated significantly lower on each subscale.

The Effect of Recognition of Counselor and Counselor Skill on Counselor Trainees' Ratings of a Videotaped Counselor Effectiveness

Most counseling training programs make extensive use of videotaped demonstrations to convey information about important aspects of counselor behavior and skills. These videotapes have been demonstrated to be effective learning tools (Merrill & Meadows, 1986), and they are conceptually consistent with the expectations of learning through modeling as outlined by Bandura (1969, 1971, 1977). Although investigations have been undertaken to assess the outcome of appropriate and inappropriate behaviors within a "self-as-model" context (Hosford & Johnson, 1983), this research has not been generalized to the situation more typically found in many counseling training applications: How is a videotape of a known counselor perceived differently from an unknown counselor? This study was designed to assess the effect of a "known" role played counselor versus an "unknown" counselor upon counselor student observers' rating of counselor effectiveness.

In a recent study by Piombo and Yager (1993), counselor trainees were asked to rate the effectiveness of a videotaped counselor. This study had addressed other dimensions in its design related to differing values/biases of the counselor. Although there were no differences in ratings of the counselor based on expressed values and biases, there was a significant difference detected between ratings of students at two separate universities involved in the

investigation. The role played counselor on all videotapes was a full-time counselor educator at one of the two institutions, who was rated considerably higher on the Counselor Rating Form's expertness subscale (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975) by observers at the home institution.

This unanticipated finding favoring the role played counselor who was familiar to the counseling student observers was the motivating element behind the present study. Was this result an unexplained artifact of one particular investigation, or can we anticipate that counselor trainees will generally rate their own instructors and supervisors more positively than unknown counselors? Furthermore, it was speculated that perceived effectiveness certainly should also be related to the skill of the role played counselor. Thus, three questions were generated for this investigation: (a) Would an "inappropriate" counselor be perceived as less effective by counselor trainees than an "appropriate" counselor? (b) Would a recognized counselor be perceived as more effective than an unrecognized counselor? (c) Would there be an interaction between these two variables (e.g., might the recognized unskilled counselor be perceived as more effective than the unrecognized skilled counselor?)?

Method

The study was conducted during regularly-scheduled counseling Practicum classes. Using a 2 X 2 design with factors including (a) Recognition of Counselor (i.e., "known" or "unknown") and (b) Counselor Skill (i.e., "appropriate" or "inappropriate"), four counseling situations were videotaped, each lasting seven

minutes. A female doctoral student in School Psychology role played the client in each video segment. She portrayed a homemaker in her mid-thirties whose husband no longer participates in the marriage or the family. She described her husband as unresponsive, preoccupied with his own concerns, and becoming increasingly reliant upon alcohol. She presented as confused, resentful, and worried about what was happening within her marriage.

For the Recognition of Counselor variable, the counselor who was known to the observers was the instructor of the practicum class. The unknown counselor was an advanced doctoral student who was on campus infrequently, having completed his coursework approximately a year earlier.

With respect to the Counselor Skill variable, the appropriate counselor demonstrated careful attention to the client, using empathy responses to encourage deeper exploration. For the inappropriate counselor role plays, the counselor focused away from the client's experience and addressed, instead, the likely feelings and reactions of the client's spouse. This counselor reacted consistently in a manner that was supportive of the client's husband (e.g., "given the stress of his job, it doesn't seem too much to have a drink or two to relax in the evenings"). His statements clearly reflected a defense of the husband's behavior and a discouragement of further exploration of the client's feelings and concerns.

Participants

Participants were 26 counseling students in masters and doctoral programs

at the University of Cincinnati. The sample included 21 females and 5 males. Thirteen students were first year masters students, 9 were second or third year masters students, and four were doctoral students. Two subjects were African American, one Asian, and 23 were Caucasian. The sample's mean age was 31.5 years with an age range of 23-46 years.

Students were randomly assigned to watch one of the four videotaped sessions. After the tape, participants completed the Counselor Rating Form (CRF; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975). The CRF was used rate of the effectiveness of the observed videotaped counselor on three subscales: expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness.

Results

Although it is clear from Table 1 that there were significant effects for both main effects (i.e., Counselor Skill and Recognition of Counselor), what was most important in terms of understanding these data was the significant interaction between the two primary variates. A multivariate analysis of variance yielded a significant interaction [$F(3,20) = 3.55$, $p = .03$]. This same result was consistently observed on each of the univariates (See Table 2): Expertness [$F(1,22) = 11.07$, $p < .01$]; Attractiveness [$F(1,22) = 7.42$, $p < .02$]; and Trustworthiness [$F(1,22) = 6.19$, $p < .03$]. Examination of the interaction curves in each case (see Table 3 for means and standard deviations and Figure 1 for the interaction curve for the Expertness variable) illustrates that the inappropriate counselor was rated virtually identically whether the role player was known or

unknown. However, in the demonstration of an appropriately skilled counselor, the unrecognized counselor was rated consistently and significantly lower on each subscale.

Discussion

The implications of these findings for counselor education may be more important than is immediately evident. Apparently, if these findings are generalizable, counselor trainees may be more likely to perceive purposefully skillful demonstrations and videotapes by recognized counselors as more effective than similar demonstrations prepared by unrecognized counselors. Admittedly, the data generated in this study cannot reasonably be generalized quite this far: in this investigation, the "recognized counselor" was one of the counselor education faculty members who's counseling skills may have been perceived by student observers as highly effective based on other, totally unrelated, exposures to his counseling in classes. It is not at all unlikely that students' advanced expectations of another "recognized" counselor might be in the opposite direction: If, for example, the role played counselor had been someone in the community who was highly recognizable from a series of highly-publicized unethical incidents, the influence of recognition might likely have been negative.

A positive set of expectations of the counselor educator serving as the role player in this study may have contributed to higher ratings in the "appropriately skilled" condition. In a fashion similar to a "response set bias," the students may have incorporated positive expectations into their ratings of the appropriate

counselor role play. Interestingly, however, this positive response set bias did not generalize to the ratings of the "inappropriately skilled" counselor role play. One hypothesis to explain the lack of any positive enhancement of ratings of the recognized counselor is that this same instructor has also regularly demonstrated a variety of inappropriate counseling behaviors in prepracticum courses as counter examples of effective counseling. Since the student observers were very likely to have seen him in situations illustrative of poor counseling skills, the positive expectations of his counseling may well be seen as only applicable to the skilled demonstration. Such positive anticipations would not carry over to influence ratings of the poor demonstration. Needless to say, whatever complex set of expectations applied to the recognized counselor, none of these related to ratings of the unrecognized counselor: the videotape itself was the sole basis for evaluation by student observers.

Clearly, conclusions can be drawn from these data:

1. Counselor trainees are able to discriminate between a counselor who attends to the client and her emotions and one who overlooks the client's feelings while making excuses for her spouse's behavior.

2. On each of the subscales of the Counseling Rating Form (i.e., expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness), counselor trainees were found to rate both the recognized and unrecognized counselor virtually identically when the videotaped performance was inappropriate. Thus, counselor trainees were able to identify that the "poor" counselor was not as expert, attractive, or trustworthy as

was the appropriately-skilled counselor.

Conclusion

Although needing replication, this study's results suggest that, in many cases, counselor educators are well advised to perform their own skill demonstrations for classes rather than purchase commercially-marketed videos (developed by individuals who are not recognizable) illustrating the same behaviors. Well-prepared and highly skilled role plays performed by counselors who are unknown to trainees are less likely to be perceived as "expert, attractive, and trustworthy." This would suggest that students may be less inclined to learn and model the skills demonstrated. Based on the results of this investigation, counselor educators can be tentatively reassured (making the likely assumption that their counseling skills are acknowledged and respected among their students) that their own skill demonstrations, both videotaped and live, are likely to be more effective in promoting student learning than demonstrations available of the same skills from other sources. If, as is likely, counselor educators choose to use some of the commercially-developed counseling demonstrations for their classes, it is recommended that they make efforts to promote the "recognition" of the videotaped counselors among the students prior to playing the demonstration.

References

Bandura, A. (1969). Principles of behavior modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Bandura, A. (1971). Psychotherapy based on modeling principles. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change. New York: John Wiley.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Barak, A. & LaCrosse, M. B. (1975). Multidimensional perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 471-476.

Hosford, R. E. & Johnson, M. E. (1983). A comparison of self-observation, self-modeling, and practice without video feedback for improving counselor interviewing behaviors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 23(1), 62-70.

Merrill, D. H. & Meadows M. (1983). Influence of intrinsic-extrinsic feedback on the empathic understanding of women counselors differing in locus of control. Journal of Human Behavior and Learning, 3(3), 25-31.

Piombo, M. & Yager, G. G. (1993, March). Counselors' personal values: Impact on perceptions of counselor effectiveness. Paper presented at the American Counseling Association Annual Convention, Atlanta, GA.

Table 1

Multivariate Tests of Significance for 2 X 2 Design with Recognition of Counselor and Counselor Skill as Variates and Counseling Rating Form Subscales as Dependent Variables

Source of Variance	Hypothesis D.F.	Error D.F.	Exact F	Signif. <
Recognition of				
Counselor (R)	3.00	20.00	5.83	.005
Counselor Skill (S)	3.00	20.00	26.21	.0001
R X S Interaction	3.00	20.00	3.56	.033

Table 2.

Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Variance Tests for the Recognition of Counselor (R) by Counselor Skill (S) Interaction

Multivariate Test

Multivariate F (3, 20) = 3.56, $p < .033$

Univariate Tests

Variables	Hypothesis MS	Error MS	F Value	Signif. <
Expertness	1013.46	91.52	11.07	.003
Attractiveness	409.85	55.22	7.42	.012
Trustworthiness	340.75	55.06	6.19	.021

Table 3.

Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Variables in Each Experimental Condition

	Recognized Counselor			Unrecognized Counselor		
	Expertness Variable					
Counselor Skill	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Appropriate	71.17	6.80	6	47.14	9.97	7
Inappropriate	31.14	11.04	7	32.17	9.54	6
	Attractiveness Variable					
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Appropriate	61.83	6.14	6	41.14	9.68	7
Inappropriate	31.43	6.24	7	26.67	6.77	6
	Trustworthiness Variable					
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Appropriate	70.33	6.15	6	55.14	7.95	7
Inappropriate	37.00	7.57	7	36.33	7.74	6

Figure 1. Interaction Curve

Counselor Rating Form - Expertness